

ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC BOARD OF REVIEW

**CASE NO. 25-1375
SIGN – COMMERCIAL GROUND SIGN
7542 DARROW ROAD**

FINAL DECISION

Based on the evidence presented by city staff at the Architectural and Historic Board of Review meeting held on January 28, 2026, the Architectural and Historic Board of Review denies the commercial ground sign proposal for case #25-1375, 7542 Darrow Road (Parcel #3003846).

The Architectural and Historic Board of Review makes the following Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal does not comply with sections V-3(b)(1) of the Architectural Design Standards stating “Ground signs should be designed to relate to and share common design elements with the building and the sign(s) attached to the building” and section V-5 stating “signs shall be framed, constructed, and erected so as to complement the overall appearance of the building and site as well as the overall appearance of the sign”. The Board finds that the proposed sign’s industrial metal appearance with no framing and visible metal screws to be in direct conflict with this requirement. This sign design is not compatible with the existing building’s western reserve architecture.
2. The proposal does not comply with Section V-5(c) stating “Signs should be fabricated on and of materials that are of permanent quality, good durability and are complimentary to the building of which they become a part.” The proposed sign materials are not compatible with the existing building.
3. The proposal does not comply with section V-5 (c) of the Architectural Design Standards stating “signs should have a matte finish, not have a glossy finish or reflective finish. The Board finds that the proposed sign has a glossy finish and therefore is in direct conflict with this requirement.
4. The sign was constructed without a zoning certificate and AHBR approval. Had the applicant approached the AHBR prior to installation, the sign could have been designed to in compliance with the Architectural Design Standards.

Furthermore, the AHBR will not grant an exception pursuant to the review criteria established in Section II-1. The AHBR finds that the proposal is not of an exceptional design, meaning it is not especially creative nor is it designed in response to a unique situation, such as a very difficult site or an unusual program requirement.

No exceptional or unusual conditions exist that are not common to other areas similarly situated and there is no resulting practical difficulty based on the following findings:

1. The property in question will yield a reasonable return and there can be beneficial use of the property without the variance. The applicant can propose and install an alternate sign that meets the design standards.

2. The variance is substantial, as the Architectural and Historic Board of Review has been consistent in requiring signs to have a matte finish and be compatible with the main building.
3. The essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance. The property is a pre-existing nonconforming use that abuts a residential neighborhood and, therefore, should make an even greater effort to adhere to the design standards.
4. The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services such as water and sewer;
5. The owner purchased the property in 2024. The requirements were in place at this time.
6. The applicant's predicament can be obviated feasibly through adjustments to the sign design.
7. The spirit and intent behind the requirement would not be observed and substantial justice would not be done by granting the exception.

Dated: _____, 2026

CITY OF HUDSON
ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC
BOARD OF REVIEW

John Caputo, Chair